



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/653,281

08/31/2000

Kevin L. Beaman

M4065.0278/P27899-0818

4745

7590

12/28/2005

Thomas J D'Amico
Dickstein Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky LLP
2101 L Street NW
Washington, DC 20037-1526

EXAMINER

BOOTH, RICHARD A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2812

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/653,281	BEAMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Richard A. Booth	2812	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-14, 16, 18, 21-29, 31 and 36-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-14, 16, 18, 21-29, 31, and 36-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/15/05 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6-14, 16, 18, 21-29, 31, and 36-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al., U.S. Patent 6,376,309 in view of Hoff et al., "Atomic Oxygen and the thermal oxidation of silicon" or Ruzylo et al., "Evaluation of Thin Oxides Grown by the Atomic Oxygen Afterglow Method".

Wang et al. shows the invention as claimed including forming a tunnel oxide 404 on a substrate 402; forming a first conductor 406 over the tunnel oxide 404; forming an insulating layer 410 over the first conductor layer, the insulating layer comprising a first oxide layer over the first conductor layer, a nitride layer over the first oxide layer, and a

second oxide layer over the nitride layer, wherein the second oxide layer is formed by oxidizing said nitride layer to a thickness of fifty angstroms (see column 3, lines 39-54); forming a second conductor layer 412 over the insulating layer; etching at least the first conductor layer, the second conductor layer, and the insulating layer, thereby defining at least one stacked structure (see Figure 3).

Note, the hydrogen and oxygen present when forming the second oxide layer will react to form steam.

Wang et al. fails to show forming the second oxide layer in a single process step using an oxidizing ambient in atomic oxygen to form the oxide layer with a thickness of 60% of a targeted thickness and at various temperatures and times.

Both Hoff et al., "Atomic Oxygen and the thermal oxidation of silicon" and Ruzyllo et al., "Evaluation of Thin Oxides Grown by the Atomic Oxygen Afterglow Method" disclose forming an oxide layer in a microwave environment using an oxidizing method with atomic oxygen in a single process step (see abstracts of both methods). In view of this disclosure, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process of Wang et al. so as to form the second oxide layer using the process taught by Hoff et al. or Ruzyllo et al. because both of these processes allow for oxide growth at low temperatures with high breakdown values. Furthermore, note that the limitation concerning 60% of a targeted thickness is essentially meaningless because the targeted thickness is not defined. For example, one of ordinary skill in the art would know through repetition of a process what the expected thickness would be and therefore this limitation is essentially meaningless.

Furthermore, the process of Hoff et al. or Ruzyllo et al. also uses atomic oxygen so one would expect similar results with respect to the thickness.

With respect to the particular time and temperature of the oxidation, it would have been obvious to determine through routine experimentation the optimum time and temperature to conduct the oxidation process based upon a variety of factors including the desired thermal budget and would not lend patentability to the instant application absent the showing of unexpected results.

Furthermore, concerning claim 31, note from Huff et al. and Ruzyllo et al. that the thickness of the oxide layer can be less than twenty angstroms or within the claimed range (see last two lines of Huff et al. reference and fig. 3 of Ruzyllo et al.).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/15/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the references fail to show a thickness which is at least 60% of a targeted thickness. However, such a claim limitation is virtually meaningless because one of ordinary skill in the art would know prior to conducting a process what the thickness would be within a small margin of error, especially when the process is repeated multiple times. Furthermore, the claim fails to describe how the targeted thickness is determined, so if one knows that the thickness of an oxide will be 60% of a targeted thickness then the examiner fails to see why the targeted thickness could not be 60% of the first targeted thickness when giving the claim its broadest reasonable interpretation. In response to applicant's argument that there is no

Art Unit: 2812

suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to combine the references is clearly laid out in the rejections stated above. Furthermore, the upper oxide layer in Wang is being replaced by the oxide layer as shown in Huff or Ruzyllo and therefore any reference to the top oxide layer in Wang is improper. With respect to the second oxide layer being formed in a single process step, note that this is also shown by the Hoff et al. and Ruzyllo et al. references.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard A. Booth whose telephone number is (571) 272-1668. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Lebentritt can be reached on (571) 272-1873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2812

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Richard A. Booth
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2812

December 19, 2005